ADELAIDE INSTITUTE

PO Box 3300
Adelaide 5067
Australia
Mob: 61+401692057
Email: info@adelaideinstitute.org
Web: http://www.adelaideinstitute.org

Online
ISSN 1440-9828

October 2010 No 535

"Spieglein, Spieglein an der Wand: Sag mir, wer ist hier der Kriminelle im Land?"

Von Kevin Käther

Kevin Käther im Holocaust-Kampf

Am 06. und 10. August 2010 tagte wieder einmal die Holocaust-Inquisition in Berlin. Das Tribunal bestand aus zwei Berufs- sowie zwei Laienrichtern (erweiterte kleine Strafkammer). Um es vorweg zu nehmen, es war wieder ein Scheingerichtsverfahren, indem SONDERGESETZE gegen einen Deutschen angewandt wurden, und da das Urteil über mich ja "im Namen des Volkes" ergangen ist, soll das Volk hiermit erfahren, wer das Urteil zu verantworten hat: Den Vorsitz dieses Prozesses hatte Herr Steitzer, der seine Unterstützung in der jungen Richterin namens Wolters fand. Die Laienrichterschaft war mit einer pädagogischen Unterrichtshilfe, Jaqueline Didszun, und einem Pensionär, Rainer Buchholz, besetzt.

Wie bereits in meinem Artikel vom 04.07.2010 im National-Journal berichtet, wurde die von mir eingelegte Berufung gegen das Urteil vom Dezember 2009 verhandelt. In erster Instanz wurde ich von den Rechtsbeugern zu 20 Monaten Haft, ausgesetzt auf drei Jahre Bewährung, verurteilt, und das nur, weil ich von meinem Recht auf Verteidigung Gebrauch gemachte hatte, indem ich in meinem Selbstanzeigeprozeß Beweisanträge zum Holocaustkomplex stellte. Die Kammer der Berufungsinstanz hat dann das Urteil auf 15 Monate herabgesetzt, erhöhte jedoch die Bewährungszeit auf vier Jahre, da ich ein echter **"Überzeugungstäter"** sei – was ich auch zugebe –, bei dem **"hinsichtlich der zu stellenden Sozialprognose Bedenken"** bestünden. **Denn dem erwarteten Kniefall und das Abschwören vor der "HEILIGEN INQUISITION" bin ich nicht nachgekommen – eben ein echter Ketzer!**

Im Verfahren stellte ich in beiden Instanzen rund 240 Beweisanträge mit einem Gesamtumfang von annähernd 15.000 Seiten. Wie nicht anders zu erwarten war, wurden all diese Beweisanträge mit vorgetäuschter und erlogener "Offenkundigkeit" des Holocausts abgelehnt. Vorgetäuscht und erlogen deshalb, da (mittlerweile) offensichtlich die einzige Offenkundigkeit des Holocausts nur noch darin besteht, daß er tatsächlich eben nicht offenkundig ist.

Zum Beispiel gab es vor einigen Monaten eine deutschlandweite Kampagne von Wahrheitssuchern und Laienhistorikern, bei der sämtliche Gerichtspräsidenten der Landes- und Oberlandesgerichte der BRD durch ein Schreiben aufgefordert wurden, mitzuteilen, was hinsichtlich des Holocausts rechtswirksam als offenkundig gilt. Das Ergebnis war, daß die Gerichte sich nicht im Stande sahen, hierüber eine verbindliche Aussage zu machen. Man hüllte sich entweder in Schweigen, verwies unter Angabe der Nichtzuständigkeit an die BRD-Hofhistoriker oder gleich an die Staatsanwaltschaften. Daraufhin wurden auch alle Generalstaatsanwaltschaften befragt, doch auch dort konnte man nur einvernehmliches Schweigen vernehmen.

Hält man sich hierzu die Vielzahl der verschieden **offiziell publizierten Opferzahlen alleine für Auschwitz vor Augen, die von 66.000 bis 8 Millionen reichen** (Cyrus Cox, Die offiziellen Auschwitz-Opferzahlen, Concept Veritas, 2010, S. 60), ist die Unfähigkeit der Gerichte und Staatsanwaltschaften, rechtsverbindliche Kriterien zur Offenkundigkeit des Holocaust zu definieren, verständlich.

Ein weiteres Beispiel und eine direkte Vorgabe zur tatsächlichen Offenkundigkeit des Holocaust kommt aus den Reihen der "anerkannten" Historiker selbst. Der von den BRD-Hofhistorikern immer wieder gern zitierte Holocaustspezialist Raul Hilberg mußte kurz vor seinem Tod, im Juni 2006, zugeben, daß im Hinblick auf die Holocaustgeschichtsschreibung noch erheblicher Forschungsbedarf bestehe. Hilberg, Verfasser der drei Bände umfassenden Dokumentation "Die Vernichtung der europäischen Juden" konstatierte: **"Wir wissen erst etwa zwanzig Prozent über den Holocaust."** (Der Standard, Wien, 10.6.2006, S. 42)

Dem pflichtete auch Jürgen Heynsel vom Jüdischen Historischen Institut Warschau bei: **"Die entscheidende Etappe beim Schreiben der Geschichte des Holocaust haben wir noch vor uns."**. ("Neues Deutschland" vom 13.10.2009: "Kein Schindler")

Damit dürfte jedem denkenden Menschen bewußt werden, daß die von den Gerichten angewandte Offenkundigkeits-"Rechtsprechung" des Bundesgerichtshofes auf einer Täuschung beruht. Nun liegt der Wahnwitz aber genau darin, daß des für einen wegen "Leugnung des Holocausts" Angeklagten nichts näher liegendes gibt, als sich mit Beweisanträgen zum Anklagegegenstand, dem Holocaust, zu verteidigen.

Nichts anderes habe ich getan, wie auch schon zuvor Horst Mahler, Sylvia Stolz, Ernst Zündel, Dirk Zimmermann und viele andere mehr.
Sämtliche dieser Scheingerichtsverfahren endeten in einer Farce, da mit der vorgetäuschten Offenkundigkeit den Angeklagten das Recht zur Verteidigung entzogen wurde.
Die politische Gesinnungsjustiz in der BRD hat damit einen Stand erreicht, der sie als ein totalitäres System demaskiert. Es werden Sondergesetze gegen Dissidenten angewandt, die dem Andersdenkenden seine verbrieften Grund- und "Menschenrechte" verwehren. Die Gerichte verweigern den wegen "Meinungsverbrechen" Angeklagten das Recht auf Verteidigung gegen den Vorwurf der Anklage und überziehen diesen mit neuen Anklagen, sofern er sich nicht knebeln läßt. Paradoxerweise, die Doppelmoral des Systems kennzeichnend, urteilte das Bundes"verfassungs"gericht über jene Kollegen, die Meinungsverbrecher zur Rechenschaft ziehen, wie folgt (2 BvR 2560/95):
"Ein Richter, der für ein bloßes Meinungsdelikt eine langjährige Haftstrafe verhängt, begeht einen unerträglichen Willkürakt und damit Rechtsbeugung... Rechtsbeugung ist schweres Unrecht. Wenn Rechtsbeugung aber zu Freiheitsentzug führt, handelt es sich um schwerstes kriminelles Unrecht!"
Spieglein, Spieglein an der Wand, wer ist hier der Verbrecher im Land?!
Nach Orwell ist diese Schizophrenie nur im "Zwiedenken" geübten Personen widerspruchsfrei möglich.
Die damit befaßten Gerichte sind bzw. wären angesichts dieser Umstände und meiner Einwände hinsichtlich der Holocaustgeschichtsschreibung von Amtswegen verpflichtet, die Beweiserhebungen meinerseits zu prüfen. "Offenkundige Tatsachen" gelten nämlich nur solange, bis neue Erkenntnisse zu Tage treten, die den bisher als "offenkundig" angenommenen Tatsachen widersprechen. Sollen weiterhin alle noch zu erwartenden neuen Erkenntnisse, die nach Raul Hilberg immerhin 80 Prozent der Holocaustforschung ausmachen, von den BRD Gerichten mit der Begründung der "Offenkundigkeit" ignoriert und sanktioniert werden?!

Der Verhandlungsverlauf

Nun aber zum Hauptgeschehen, dem eigentlichem Verhandlungsverlauf. Das Verfahren an sich gestaltete sich recht kurz. Auf das Verlesen von Beweisanträgen zum Holocaust verzichtete ich, da ich diesbezüglich bereits alles vorgebracht hatte. Meine vorgelegten Beweise sind bereits aktenkundig und so kann nicht behauptet werden, daß man dies alles nicht gewußt hätte. Meine Einlassung beschränkte sich, abgesehen vom Geständnis zu meinem Verteidigungsverhalten, überwiegend auf die "Verfassungs"widrigkeit des § 130 StGB-BRD. Hierzu verlas ich ein Gutachten zur Bedeutung des Beschlusses des 1. Senats des Bundes"verfassungs"gerichts vom 4. November 2009 für § 130 Abs. 3 StGB (1 BvR 2150-08). In diesem Gutachten offenbaren die Entscheidungsgründe die "verfassungs"rechtliche Fehlerhaftigkeit des § 130 Abs. 3 StGB in dreierlei Hinsichten:
1. Die Norm ist ein meinungsbeschränkendes Sondergesetz und als solches von Artikel 5 Abs. 1 GG verboten, indem es die Strafbarkeit nicht an die Leugnung pp. von Völkermorden allgemein knüpft, sondern an die unter der Herrschaft des Nationalsozialismus begangenen Taten dieser Art (Entscheidungsgründe Textziffer 48 ff., insbesondere Tz 61).
2. Die Bestimmung des "öffentlichen Friedens" als Schutzgut bedarf nach der "Wechselwirkungslehre" der verfassungskonformen Reduktion dahingehend, daß die "Friedlichkeit" gewährleistet wird. Bezweckt ist danach "der Schutz vor Äußerungen, die ihrem Inhalt nach erkennbar auf rechtsgutgefährdende Handlungen hin angelegt sind, das heißt den Übergang zu Aggression oder Rechtsbruch markieren. Die Wahrung des öffentlichen Friedens bezieht sich insoweit auf die Außenwirkungen von Meinungsäußerungen etwa durch Appelle oder Emotionalisierungen, die bei den Angesprochenen Handlungsbereitschaft auslösen oder Hemmschwellen herabsetzen oder Dritte unmittelbar einschüchtern." (Textziffer 78)
3. Das Tatbestandsmerkmal "Weise, die geeignet ist den öffentlichen Frieden zu stören" ist zu unbestimmt und hat deshalb im Hinblick auf den Bestimmtheitsgrundsatz der Verfassung (Artikel 103 Abs. 2 GG) nur die Bedeutung eines "Korrektivs" im Sinne einer "Wertungsformel zur Ausscheidung nicht strafwürdig erscheinender Fälle". (Textziffer 94)
Weiterhin zitierte ich jene Stimmen, die sich bereits öffentlich gegen den Maulkorbparagraphen § 130 StGB-BRD ausgesprochen haben, diesen anprangerten oder sogar dessen Abschaffung forderten. **Zu diesen Persönlichkeiten zählten die Ex-Bundesverfassungsrichter Wolfgang Hoffmann-Riem und Winfried Hassemer ebenso, wie die jüdischen Persönlichkeiten Henryk M. Broder, Gilad Atzmon, Yehuda Elkana, Oliver Stone, Hajo G Meyer und Geoffrey Alderman vom Jewish Chronicle.**
Im Anschluß daran prangerte ich die Tatsache an, daß man sich als Angeklagter in Holocaustprozessen nicht verteidigen darf, obwohl die Verteidigung das grundlegendste Element in einem Strafprozeß ist. Mein Ketzerprozeß veranschaulicht diesen Umstand mit eindringlicher Deutlichkeit. Der Vorsitzende Steitzer quittierte mir diesen Umstand dankenswerterweise sogar, indem er mir ins Urteil auf Seite 12 schrieb:
"Auch die Tatsache, daß der Angeklagte sämtliche Äußerungen im Rahmen seines Verteidigungsverhaltens vorbrachte, stehen nach Auffassung der Kammer einer Bestrafung wegen Volksverhetzung nach § 130 Abs. 3 StGB nicht entgegen. Im Rahmen der geltenden Rechtsordnung sind offiziell bestimmte Verteidigungsverhalten ausgeschlossen."
Dieses richterliche "Geständnis" ist das Bekenntnis, Holocaust-Dissidenten total rechtlos zu machen und die international verbrieften Menschenrechte bewußt auszuhebeln. Im Übrigen ist die oben genannte Formulierung ohnehin verklausulierter Schwachsinn, denn **was bitte ist ein "offiziell bestimmtes Verteidigungsverhalten" und wer definiert das?** Mein (selbst)bestimmtes Verteidigungsverhalten lag schlichtweg darin, daß ich Erklärungen verlesen, Beweisanträge eingebracht und Anträge zur Ladung von Zeugen zu einem bestimmten geschichtlichen Ereignis gestellt habe, von dem ich überzeugt bin, daß es anders verlaufen ist, als es uns die Geschichtsschreibung der Sieger der Weltkriege suggeriert.
Unbeachtet in der Urteilsbegründung blieb zudem die Tatsache, daß ich vor der Verlesung meiner Beweisanträge den Antrag auf Ausschluß der Öffentlichkeit gestellt hatte, um eben niemanden "verhetzen" zu können bzw. um meine Verteidigung gegen den Vorwurf der "Leugnung des Holocaust" ohne neue Straftaten im Sinnes des § 130 StBG-BRD zu gewährleisten. Auch dieser Antrag wurde abgelehnt, wodurch ich quasi genötigt wurde, im Rahmen meiner Beweiserhebungen erneut "Volksverhetzungen" zu begehen.
Im Plädoyer meines Verteidigers kam dann noch einmal zur Sprache, daß der Tatbestand der "Leugnung" keinesfalls erfüllt sein kann, denn um einen Sachverhalt leugnen zu können, muß man am "Ort des Geschehens" gewesen sein. Weiterhin verdeutlichte er die Schwierigkeit des Verteidigers, seinen Mandanten in solchen Verfahren verteidigen zu können. Er machte auf die vernachlässigte Fürsorgepflicht der damals betrauten Kammer aufmerksam und beantragte, mich freizusprechen. Zum dann folgenden Plädoyer von Staatsanwalt Pritzel bleibt nicht viel zu sagen, denn dieses machte den Eindruck, nur aus auswendig gelernten Textbausteinen zu bestehen, die so oder so ähnlich auch schon in den anderen Holocaustprozessen vorgetragen wurden. Er gab zwar zu, daß es überall vermehrt zu Unmutsbekundungen hinsichtlich des § 130 StGB kommt, diese aber völlig irrelevant seien, **"da § 130 StGB-BRD verfassungskonform ist"** und der Gesetzgeber bislang auch noch nichts dagegen unternommen hätte.

Dann wurde mir das Schlusswort erteilt. Ich ging auf das Plädoyer des Staatsanwaltes ein. Ich machte deutlich, daß die Gerichte und die Staatsanwaltschaften Organe der Rechtspflege sind und es nicht nur ihre Pflicht ist, Recht anzuwenden, sondern auch Gesetze abzuändern, falls diese mit dem Recht in Konflikt stehen. Anhand der "Menschenrechtsverbrechen" gegen die oben bereits genannten Dissidenten verdeutlichte ich, daß hier erheblicher Handlungsbedarf besteht und diese Verletzungen der Grund- und "Menschenrechte" nicht länger geduldet werden könnten und dürften. **Ich forderte letztlich die Abschaffung der Scheingerichtsbarkeit in Holocaustprozessen.**

Die Verantwortungslosigkeit und das Desinteresse im Hinblick auf Gesetzesänderungen spiegelten sich dann am folgenden Verhandlungstag im Urteil von fünfzehn Monaten Haft auf vier Jahre Bewährung wider. Die Revision gegen dieses Urteil ist eingelegt. Sollte die Revision nicht erfolgreich sein, so kann auf eine "Verfassungs"beschwerde nicht verzichtet werden.

Interessant ist noch, daß ich eine Woche nach meiner Verurteilung eine erneute Ladung für den 25.10.2010 und 01.11.2010 um jeweils 9.00 Uhr im Saal 621 des Landgerichtes Berlin erhalten habe. Diesmal soll meine Selbstanzeige neu verhandelt, denn, wie bereits bekannt geworden ist, hat das Kammergericht das Urteil wegen fehlender Öffentlichkeit kassiert und zurückverwiesen. **Im kommenden Gerichtsverfahren sind Lea Rosh, Ernst Nolte und der "Antisemitismusprofessor" Wolfgang Benz als Zeugen geladen.** Eine rege Öffentlichkeit ist dieses Mal sehr erwünscht. Man darf gespannt sein!

Spendenkonto:
Kevin Käther
Deutsche Bank
Bankleitzahl: 12070024
Kontonummer: 391104700
IBAN: DE80120700240391104700
BIC/SWIFT: DEUTDEDB160
E-Post: kevinkaether@gmx.de

Zu guter Letzt möchte ich mich noch mal bei all jenen bedanken, die mir treu zur Seite stehen und mich unterstützt haben.

Ich grüße Freund und Feind gleichermaßen und verbleibe in der Hoffnung, daß auch jene endlich wach werden, die im Moment noch verblendet und irregeleitet sind.

"Nur die Lüge braucht die Stütze der Staatsgewalt, die Wahrheit steht von alleine aufrecht." (Benjamin Franklin)

Wer die Wahrheit nicht kennt,
ist nur ein Dummkopf.
Wer sie aber kennt,
und sie eine Lüge nennt ist ein Verbrecher.
- Bertholt Brecht

Kevin Käther
Berlin, den 8. September 2010

Quelle: http://globalfire.tv/nj/10de/verfolgungen/kevins_berufungsverhandlung.htm

---

Mirror, Mirror on the Wall: Who's the Greatest Crook of All?

By Kevin Käther

Translated from the German by J M Damon

My "Holocaust" Inquisition Tribunal met again on 6th and 10th August 2010.

It consisted of two professional and two lay judges, making it an expanded appeals court (such courts normally have one professional and two lay judges.)

As expected, it devolved into another show trial. Sixty-five years after the end of World War II our so-called Federal Republic is still acting as an occupation government, applying SONDERGESETZE (special anti German laws) against Germans who want to be German.

Since my verdict was pronounced "in the name of the people," the people should know the names of those who are responsible for the verdict.

The presiding judge was a Mr. Steitzer, who was assisted by a young female professional judge named Wolters.

The lay judges were a pedagogical consultant, Jaqueline Didszun, and a retiree, Rainer Buchholz.

As already reported in my National Journal article dated 4 July 2010, this trial was an appeal of the verdict of my original self-accusation trial, which took place in December 2009.

[See http://globalfire.tv/nj/10en/persecution/kevins_new_holotrial]

In the original trial the RECHTSBEUGERN (law-twisters) sentenced me to 20 months, probated for three years, for no other reason than that I attempted to defend myself through submission of evidentiary motions concerning the "Holocaust" complex.

The appeal court reduced my sentence to 15 months. However, it increased my probation to four years, since I am obviously an ÜBERZEUGUNGSTÄTER (culprit who acts out of conviction), which I freely admit.

As the verdict states, my "...social prognosis gives grave cause for concern."

Since I did not fall to my knees and abjure my convictions before this unholy "Holy Inquisition," I am a true heretic!

In my trials I have now submitted some 240 evidentiary motions with a total of around 15,000 pages.

As expected, the Court disallowed each and every motion under the pretense of the fraudulent "Manifest Obviousness of Holocaust."

I say "fraudulent" because it is obvious to everyone that the only truly obvious thing about "Holocaust" is the fact that it is not obvious.

For example, several months ago a nationwide campaign of independent historians and truth-seekers petitioned all the court presidents in Germany to explain what can be considered "obvious" about "Holocaust."

The result was that not a single court was able to give a binding legal response.

They either cloaked themselves in silence or else referred the question to state prosecutors.

We asked the same question of the prosecutors and again got nothing but silence.

The reason why the courts and prosecutors are unable to establish legal criteria for the "Manifest Obviousness of Holocaust" becomes clear when we consider the multiplicity of official numbers of victims for Auschwitz.

They range from 66,000 to 8,000,000!

[Cyrus Cox, DIE OFFIZIELLEN AUSCHWITZ-OPFERZAHLEN (Auschwitz Forensically Examined), Concept Veritas, 2010, p. 60).

Even the works of the officially acknowledged "Holocaust" historians provide ample evidence of the lack of "obviousness:"

"Holocaust" Specialist Raul Hilberg, who is frequently quoted

by official historians, was compelled to admit shortly before his death in August 2007 that a great deal of research remains to be done in "Holocaust" historiography. Hilberg, author of the three-volume "The Destruction of European Jews," admitted: "...At most, we know around 20 percent of the story of Holocaust."

Jürgen Heynsel of the Jewish Historical Institute in Warsaw supports him in this, saying "The decisive event in writing the history of Holocaust still remains to be done." (NEUES DEUTSCHLAND, 13 Oct 2009, "Kein Schindler.")

This suggests to every thinking person that the courts' application of "Manifest Obviousness" is based on a falsehood.

The great "Catch-22" that makes these trials a legalistic joke is the fact that the only way a person accused of "Denying Holocaust" can defend himself is by submitting evidentiary motions relating to "Holocaust."

This is precisely what I did, as Horst Mahler, Silvia Stolz, Ernst Zündel, Dirk Zimmermann and many others have done before me.

All these show trials ended in a complete farce since the absurd doctrine of "Manifest Obviousness" takes away the accuser's right to defend himself.

The legalities contrived to suppress dissident opinion in Germany that expose the "Federal Republic" as a totalitarian system.

Our government applies special laws against dissidents that withhold basic human rights from the unconventional thinker, deny the accused all defense against the indictment, and overwhelm him with still more charges if he resists being gagged.

Paradoxically (but completely typical of our System), the Federal Constitutional Court has issued the following admonition concerning its colleagues who prosecute opinion criminals (2 BvR 2560/95):

A judge who imposes a long prison sentence for a sole crime of opinion is committing an intolerable act of WILLKÜR (arbitrariness) and RECHTSBEUGING (perverting the law.)

Perverting the law is a great injustice and, when it leads to incarceration, a serious crime...

Mirror mirror on the wall, who's the greatest criminal of all?

As Orwell explained in "Nineteen Eighty-Four", the prevailing official schizophrenia can exist only among persons accustomed to "Doublethink."

[Orwell described Doublethink as follows:

"The power of holding two contradictory beliefs in one's mind simultaneously, and accepting both of them.... To tell deliberate lies while genuinely believing in them, to forget any fact that has become inconvenient, and then, when it becomes necessary again, to draw it back from oblivion for just so long as it is needed, to deny the existence of objective reality and all the while to take account of the reality which one denies — all this is indispensably necessary. Even in using the word doublethink it is necessary to exercise doublethink. For by using the word one admits that one is tampering with reality; by a fresh act of doublethink one erases this knowledge; and so on indefinitely, with the lie always one leap ahead of the truth."]

Because of my pleadings and objections concerning "Holocaust", the courts have a legal obligation to consider my evidentiary motions.

It is genuinely obvious that "Manifest Obviousness" can be valid only until new evidence comes to light that challenges the assumptions that were heretofore considered obvious. According to Raul Hilberg 80% of authentic "Holocaust" research remains to be done -- will the German courts refuse to consider new knowledge forever under their doctrine of "Manifest Obviousness?"

Now let's consider the main event - the actual course of my trial, which took very little time.

I dispensed with reading my evidentiary motions; since I had already said everything I had to say about "Holocaust."

The evidence I presented is all part of the official record, and so the Establishment cannot claim that it has no knowledge of it.

Except for my plea of guilty in conducting my defense, my opening statement concerned the incompatibility of Section 130 of the Penal Code with our so-called Constitution, which guarantees freedom of opinion.

In support of this I read an expert opinion on the significance of the court ruling of the First Senate of BUNDESFASSUNGSGERICHT (Constitutional Court) dated 4 Nov 2009 as it relates to Section 130 Paragraph 3 of the Penal Code (1BvR2150-08).

In the legal basis for its decision, this expert opinion explains the threefold erroneousness of Section 130 of the Penal Code as follows:

1. It is a Special Law limiting and restricting opinion. As such it is proscribed by Article 5 Paragraph 1 of Basic Law because it relates to acts that occurred under National Socialism rather than punishment of the denial of genocide in general. (Grounds for Decision 48-, especially Tz61).

2. The determination of "ÖFFENTLICHER FRIEDE" ("Public Peace") as something that must be protected by law requires that "FRIEDLICHKEIT" ("peaceableness") be assured in accordance with WECHSELWIRKUNGSLEHRE (interaction principle) of the measure: it must be compatible with the Constitution.

Thus the purpose is "... protection against expressions that are identifiable through their content as threats in the legal domain, that is, acts that indicate a transition to aggression or violation of law.

The preservation of public peace concerns the perception of expressions of opinions such as emotionally laden appeals that incite a readiness to act, reduce hesitation levels or directly intimidate third parties among the persons addressed." (Item 78)

3. The stated offense in "...a manner that might disturb the public peace" is too vague.

In relation to the constitutional principle of definiteness (ARTIKEL 103 ABS. 2 GG), it has no significance other that that of a "corrective" in considering the deletion of cases that do not appear to be punishable." (Item 94)

I then went on to quote prominent individuals who have spoken out publicly against the "muzzling paragraphs" of Section 130 and demanded its abolition.

Among these are former Federal Constitutional Judges Wolfgang Hoffmann-Riem and Winfried Hassemer as well as prominent Jewish advocates of free speech Henryk M. Broder, Gilad Atzmon, Yehuda Elkana, Oliver Stone, Hajo G Meyer und Geoffrey Alderman of the Jewish Chronicle.

I join these enlightened activists in decrying the fact that accused persons in German courts are not allowed to defend themselves – a legal right that is indispensable in any nation of laws!

My witch trial clearly illustrates this crisis, which Judge Steitzer acknowledges on page 12 of my verdict:

"In the opinion of the Court, the defendant's numerous arguments do not override the prescribed punishment for Incitement under Section 130 Paragraph 3 of the Penal Code.

In our present legal system, defense is not allowed."
This "confession" is acknowledgement of the Federal Republic's violation of the internationally guaranteed human rights of defendants.
It completely takes away their ability to defend themselves.
In any case, the law's formulation is itself VERKLAUSULIERTER SCHWACHSINN (legalistic imbecility):
what in the world is "OFFIZIELL BESTIMMTES VERTEIGUNGSVERHALTEN" (officially ascertained defense conduct)?
Who defines or decides it?
My self-determined defense consisted of explanations, motions to submit evidence and motions to call expert witnesses for a specific historical event.
I read and submitted motions that present historical events differently from the way they are depicted by the victors of the World Wars.
The statement of grounds for the verdict ignored the fact that before reading my evidentiary motions, I submitted a motion to exclude the public.
I did this in order to avoid "inciting" anyone and to enable a defense against the charge of "Denying Holocaust" without incurring new criminal charges in view of Section 130 of the Penal Register.
This motion too was disallowed, which compelled me to commit an additional "Incitement of the Masses" felony merely by submitting evidence!
In his pleading, my attorney again pointed out that the *corpus delicti* of "Holocaust Denial" cannot possibly be fulfilled since one must have been present at the scene of the crime in order to deny the issue.
Then he went on to depict the defense attorney's difficulties in defending his client in "Holocaust" trials.
Then he emphasized the danger of the Court's disregarding its fiduciary or caretaking obligation and made a motion for my acquittal.
There is not much to be said regarding Prosecutor Pritzel's pleading, which consisted of a recitation of the same memorized "building blocks" of text that are repeated in all "Holocaust" trials.
He admitted that there are widespread and growing expressions of dissatisfaction with Section 130.
In his opinion these are irrelevant, since Section 130 is compatible with the "constitution" of the Federal Republic. So far, the legislative branch of government has done nothing to change it.
Then it was my turn to speak and I addressed the pleading of the prosecutor.
I emphasized that the courts and state attorneys are all organs for the administration of justice.
They have an obligation not only to enforce existing laws, but also to strive to change them when they conflict with universal norms of justice.
Then I stressed the pressing need for remedial action on account of official violations of dissidents' rights.
These crass violations of basic human rights must no longer be tolerated!
I concluded by demanding the abolition of "Holocaust" show trials such as mine, in which "the truth is no defense" and both the defendant and his counsel are prosecuted for submitting exculpatory evidence.
On the next trial day, the Establishment's complete irresponsibility and lack of interest in legislative reform were reflected in my new sentence of fifteen months' incarceration probated over four years.
I have already filed an appeal of this verdict. In case that appeal is not successful, there still remains the possibility of an appeal on "constitutional" grounds.
It is also interesting that just a week after my conviction, I received a new summons for the 25th of October and 1st of November 2010 at 9:00 am in Room 621 of Berlin District Court.
This time I will be retried on my self-accusation charge. As I explained earlier, the Superior Court vacated and overturned my conviction on account of inadequate publicity.
In the coming trial / Lea Rosh, Ernst Nolte and the "Professor of Anti Semitism" Wolfgang Benz / have been summoned as witnesses.
It will be very helpful / if there is a large turnout for this trial. It will be interesting!
In closing I would like to thank everyone who has supported me.
I salute friend and foe alike and sincerely hope that those who are still blind and duped will finally wake up!

*

Only Lies need the protection of the State,
the Truth can stand alone.
Benjamin Franklin

*

He who does not know the truth is merely ignorant.
He who knows the truth and calls it a lie is a criminal!
Bertholt Brecht

*

Kevin Käther
Berlin, 8th September 2010

****

The translator is a "Germanophilic Germanist" who makes German articles about the German plight accessible to those who do not read German.

Here's freedom to him who would speak,
Here's freedom to him who would write;
For there's none ever feared that the truth should be heard,
Save him whom the truth would indict!
ROBERT BURNS (1759–96)

The original is posted at:
http://globalfire.tv/nj/10de/verfolgungen/kevins_berufungsverhandlung.htm

---

Lieber Christian,
wie Du ja weißt, hatte ich vor zwei Wochen mal wieder einen Prozeß. Dieses Scheingerichtsverfahren endete mit 1 Jahr und 3 Monaten auf 4 Jahre Bewährung. In der mündlichen Urteilsbegründung sagte mir der Richtervasall wörtlich, daß man sich als Angeklagter in Holocaustprozessen nicht verteidigen darf. Das war ja mal ein gutes Geständnis. Werde in den nächsten Tagen einen umfassenden Bericht verfassen, im NJ veröffentlichen und mit der Holocaustjustiz abrechnen.
Letzte Woche habe ich eine erneute Ladung für den 25.10 und 01.11.10 erhalten. Diesmal wird die Selbstanzeige neu verhandelt, denn wie Du ja weißt, hat das Kammergericht das Urteil wegen fehlender Öffentlichkeit kassiert und zurückverwiesen. Und das ich am 25.10 nicht so alleine bin hat man mir Lea Rosh, Ernst Nolte und unseren Antisemitismusprofessor Wolfgang Benz als Zeugen geladen. Das wird sicherlich ein Riesenspaß.

Hast Du eventuelle Anregungen? Ich wollte mir diese Chance eigentlich nicht entgehen lassen, denn solche hat man nicht alle Tage. Ich beabsichtige eine Art Fragenkatalog zusammenstellen? Am Besten für jeden 3 Hauptfragen, die sofort bloßstellen und 3 als eventuelle „Ausweichfragen", falls man versucht mich mundtot zu machen. Übrigens haben nun schon zwei Richter unabhängig voneinander gesagt, daß dieser Fall nach Freispruch aussieht. Wäre dies der Fall, so könnte ich straffrei die „Vorlesungen" von Rudolf in der BRD verbreiten.

Das wäre für den Revisionismus ein enormer Erfolg.

Beste Grüße

Kevin

THE POPULIST I am therefore become your enemy, because I tell you the Truth?

Jeff Prager: What Is The One Subject We Are NOT Allowed To Discuss?

~ Damned If I Do And Damned If I Don't

It isn't abortion. It isn't illegal immigration. No, it isn't sex either. No, it isn't health problems, it isn't personal finance and it isn't marriage or anything like that. It's not crime, fraud, war or racism. It isn't 9/11 and it isn't Kennedy's death. It also isn't Martin Luther Kings death. None of those things. We, as adults, are allowed to ask questions about all of them. Well, maybe not 9/11 but we still discuss it openly.

We are not allowed to question the Holocaust and the 6 million Jews that were killed. NO Questions allowed. WE know the facts. OR do we?

I was born a Jew. An Ashkenazi Jew, a Khazar. I had, as a child, very elderly relatives with numbers tattooed on their upper arms. A dozen of them. So I have EVERY RIGHT to ask questions and of course I was certain that I would confirm everything I had been taught in my very American schooling. I was wrong. I confirmed NOTHING and found a wealth of evidence that discredits the mainstream perspective so much so that it appears that at this point a Holocaust as it's described historically just NEVER happened.

I know, I can hear you, call me a Holocaust denier. It's OK. I can handle it. I prefer exhaustive research and the truth as opposed to living a lie. I also realize it's difficult, virtually impossible, to admit to oneself that you may have been deceived on such a grand scale. It hurts, quite frankly. I know.

So, rather then go into great detail I'm going to leave it to you to investigate this yourself by providing many links described below. But before I do that I want to point out a few things for everyone, especially for those that may have visited Auschwitz-Birkenau, Belzec, Chelmno, Majdanek, Sobibor, or Treblinka.

The evidence I have used and examined is from trial testimony, photographs, investigations by Jewish authors and testimony from military personnel and civilians that were there. This information is NOT easy to find because no one wants you to find it but thanks to the internet it is available.

Everything below is TRUE. Here is just a SMALL portion of what I've found. A VERY SMALL PORTION.

There was NEVER an order from Hitler to exterminate the Jews.

Daily Express

NO. 10,258. FRIDAY, MARCH 24, 1933. ONE PENNY.

JUDEA DECLARES WAR ON GERMANY

Jews Of All The World Unite In Action

BOYCOTT OF GERMAN GOODS

MASS DEMONSTRATIONS IN MANY DISTRICTS

DRAMATIC ACTION

HIGHER WAGES FOR STEEL WORKERS

AN INCREASE OF THREE SHILLINGS A WEEK

BRIGHT SPOT IN A BLACK TOWN

New "Sweep" Bill In The Dail

MR. DE VALERA AND STATE CONTROL

SECRET MEASURE

MR. MacDONALD EXPLAINS HIS TOUR

"PEACE CAN BE KEPT IN EUROPE"

LATE NEWS

OFFICERS' DAYS OF LOVE

CUTS THAT KILL

World Jewry declared war on Hitler well before there were any wars and they did this publicly in Newspapers and with Boycotts and Rallies to prevent people globally from buying anything made in Germany. This was done while the US was still supporting German commerce and business through our banks and financial institutions. The Zionists DID NOT support this Boycott.

Auschwitz had a large outdoor swimming pool INSIDE the prisoners quarters, the prisoners played soccer, put on shows in the theater and had stores of various types. There was even a brothel located INSIDE the prisoners quarters, inside the fenced in housing area. The prisoners were afforded a half hour for lunch and worked 8 hours each day. They bought jellies, jams, stamps, cards and paper at a kanteen.

During the war prisoners in concentration camps received 1700 calories a day in rations or meals, far greater then the average 700 calories a day the German people were able to get. Food was scarce but these prison camps weren't Concentration Camps, they were Work Camps and the German War Machine required a huge wealth of human labor and they had every reason to preserve life.

To prevent disease the Germans fumigated the shoes, bedding, mattresses and clothing of prisoners regularly with Zyclon-B, a cyanide gas used in Britain and America for the very same purpose.

It was only towards the end of the war that food became scarce and that's why we've all seen pictures of very skinny emaciated prisoners. Also towards the end of the war prisoners were not cared for quite as well and diseases began to spread as a result of fleas and other infestations.

The pictures we've all seen of the many bodies piled in makeshift gullies are prisoners that died of disease and hunger, not prisoners that were tortured or murdered. These bodies piled up faster then they could be disposed of and they were routinely placed in ditches and burned to prevent the spread of Typhus and other communicable diseases.

The entire theme of soap, lampshades and other things "made from Jewish prisoners" was proven to be a totally fabricated story and none of this is true. It just never happened.

The plaque on display at the Auschwitz camp until 1989 noted "4 million" victims. The plaque currently on display at Auschwitz (2002) was suddenly reduced and the number of victims is now 1.5 million – a casual reduction in the number of deaths by 2.5 million which never appeared in the American "free press."

I've checked out Churchill's Second World War and not a single mention of Nazi 'gas chambers,' a 'genocide' of the Jews, or of 'six million' Jewish victims of the war. This is astonishing. How can it be explained? Eisenhower's Crusade in Europe is a book of 559 pages; the six volumes of Churchill's Second World War total 4,448 pages; and de Gaulle's three-volume M?©moires de guerre is 2,054 pages. In this mass of writing, which altogether totals 7,061 pages (not including the introductory parts), published from 1948 to 1959, one will find no mention either of Nazi 'gas chambers,' a 'genocide' of the Jews, or of 'six million' Jewish victims of the war.

Richard Lynn, Professor Emeritus, University of Ulster, December 5, 2005

What about the population of Jews? Per World Almanac figures, it INCREASED by 584,549 between 1941 and 1948. So, this being the case, where did the 6,000,000 dead go?

All world almanacs show that during WWII the number of Jews in Europe remained flat, but Britannica Book of the Year reports that the number of Jews in the world increased by 600,000, or 4%. How could 6 million Jews (40% of all Jews and 64% of those in Europe) have died in the Holocaust if their worldwide population increased by 4%?

Each year for decades, tens of thousands of visitors to Auschwitz have been shown an execution "gas chamber" in the main camp, supposedly in its "original state." In January 1995 the prestigious French weekly magazine L'Express acknowledged that "everything" about this "gas chamber" is "false," and that it is in fact a deceitful postwar reconstruction but the American media said nothing about this.

Many thousands of secret German wartime documents dealing with Auschwitz were confiscated after the war by the Allies. But not a single one refers to a policy or program of extermination. In fact, the familiar Auschwitz extermination story cannot be reconciled with the documentary evidence.

It is often claimed that all Jews at Auschwitz who were unable to work were immediately killed. Jews who were too old, young, sick, or weak were supposedly gassed on arrival, and only those who could be worked to death were temporarily kept alive.

But the evidence shows otherwise. In fact, a very high percentage of the Jewish inmates were not able to work, and were nevertheless not killed. For example, an internal German telex message dated Sept. 4, 1943, from the chief of the Labor Allocation department of the SS Economic and Administrative Main Office (WVHA), reported that of 25,000 Jews held in Auschwitz, only 3,581 were able to work, and that all of the remaining Jewish inmates — some 21,500, or about 86 percent — were unable to work.

This is also confirmed in a secret report dated April 5, 1944, on "security measures in Auschwitz" by Oswald Pohl, head of the SS concentration camp system, to SS chief Heinrich Himmler. Pohl reported that there was a total of 67,000 inmates in the entire Auschwitz camp complex, of whom 18,000 were hospitalized or disabled. In the Auschwitz II camp (Birkenau), supposedly the main extermination center, there were 36,000 inmates, mostly female, of whom "approximately 15,000 are unable to work."

The evidence shows that Auschwitz-Birkenau was established primarily as a camp for Jews who were not able to work, including the sick and elderly, as well as for those who were temporarily awaiting assignment to other camps. That is the considered view of Dr. Arthur Butz of Northwestern University, who also says that this was an important reason for the unusually high death rate there.

Jewish scholar Arno Mayer, a professor of history at Princeton University, acknowledges in his 1988 book about the "final solution" that more Jews perished at Auschwitz as a result of typhus and other "natural" causes than were executed.

THERE IS SO MUCH MORE!

Now, there is A LOT of data to read and several videos to watch that have led me to these conclusions so if you intend to argue with me I would suggest you examine the very same data that I have. Personally, I believe we all owe it to ourselves to do so, rather then just accept a part of history that may not be true. How many of you know that George Washington NEVER chopped down a Cherry Tree? There are MANY episodes throughout history that we take for granted because, well just because we do. And there are many instances where these episodes were conjured up as propaganda, took on a life of their own and became history when in fact they are not. If we are to hold an opinion that something happened as severe as the Holocaust are we not fully responsible to investigate the data to be sure it's true?

Here are just a few of my references:

Pages From The Auschwitz Death Registry Volumes Long-Hidden Death Certificates Discredit Extermination Claims

http://www.ihr.org/jhr/v12/v12p265_Weber.html

An official Polish report on the Auschwitz 'gas chambers' Krakow Forensic Institute Confirms Leuchter's Findings

http://www.ihr.org/jhr/v11/v11p207_Staff.html

The 'Problem of the Gas Chambers'

http://www.ihr.org/jhr/v01/v01p103_Faurisson.html

The Leuchter Report: The How and the Why. Scroll down to: Auschwitz and Birkenau

http://www.ihr.org/jhr/v09/v09p133_Leuchter.html

Auschwitz: Myths and Facts. By Mark Weber

http://www.ihr.org/leaflets/auschwitz.shtml

'Did Six Million Really Die?' Report of the Evidence in the Canadian 'False News' Trial of Ernst Zündel

http://www.ihr.org/books/kulaszka/falsenews.toc.html

Judea Declares War on Germany – Google Video Presents factual data regarding the war and the camps

http://video.google.com/videoplay?docid=4138523842550891901&hl=en #

German Trial proves 300,000 Die At Auschwitz

http://www.fpp.co.uk/Auschwitz/docs/controversies/deathroll/Wochenschau1948.html

The Holocaust: Let's Hear Both Sides

http://www.ihr.org/leaflets/bothsides.shtml

The Swimming Pools at the Camps

http://www.scrapbookpages.com/auschwitzscrapbook/tour/Auschwitz1/AuschwitzPool.html

Auschwitz – Myths and Facts

http://www.ihr.org/leaflets/auschwitz.shtml

The Money used in the Camps

http://www.wintersonnenwende.com/scriptorium/english/archives/articles/ccmoney.html

Now, I am not saying that Jews weren't killed, they were.

I'm saying that the Holocaust didn't happen the way I've been taught, that most of the deaths were from diseases and starvation because allied bombing prevented commerce and food was severely rationed. I'm saying that towards the end of the war bodies piled up far more quickly then they could be disposed of and that they were hurriedly disposed of in ditches and burned to prevent the further spread of disease.

I'm saying that I don't like being lied to and this myth has been used to extract millions of dollars from Western and European Countries.

I'm saying the truth comes with a burden and that it's as heartbreaking as the lies, maybe more so. There are many more links. I'll leave it to you, the reader, to find them.

The truth is NOT elusive, it's just not discussed.

This entry was posted on Sunday, July 25th, 2010 at 8:40 am and is filed under , Features, The Jewish Question. You can follow any responses to this entry through the RSS 2.0 feed.

2 Responses to "What Is The One Subject We Are NOT Allowed To Discuss? ~ Damned If I Do And Damned If I Don't"

What Is The One Subject We Are NOT Allowed To Discuss? ~ Damned If … list university says:

July 25, 2010 at 10:17 am

[...] more here: What Is The One Subject We Are NOT Allowed To Discuss? ~ Damned If … By admin | category: Martin Luther University | tags: are-allowed, ask-questions, [...]

Thou shalt not discuss Holocaust « Rehmat's World says:

July 27, 2010 at 5:49 pm

[...] Now comes Jeff Prager, a Jewish writer, who too questioned Holocaust current narrative in What is the one subject we are not allowed to discuss?. [...]

Von Ribbentrop's watch

What would you do if you were Jewish and had bought a second-hand watch for £150, only to find out that it once belonged to Hitler's right-hand man and as a result was worth £50,000?

By Sean O'Hare, 13 September 2010

In 1985 British screenwriter Laurence Marks was given a Hollywood mansion, wrote comedy for Paramount Studios, drove a red convertible, and was deeply unhappy.

He hoped an afternoon's shopping trip and the purchase of a $200 dollar second-hand watch on Los Angeles's Melrose Place would lift his mood.

"I felt isolated. I had everything but I pined for London, its culture and my friends. It was the loneliest time of my life and I thought spending some money would cheer me up," he tells me.

In the second-hand watch shop's window display, Laurence spied a simple Longines Art Deco watch and left the shop twenty minutes later wearing it on his wrist.

Von Ribbentrop's watch, found by Laurence Marks.

"I couldn't stop staring at it, though never once did I wonder who it belonged to or why it was in the shop window," he says.

Returning to London after less a year as an expat in LA, Laurence opted for a change of watch and bought one at auction, placing the Longines in a safety deposit box in a London bank where it stayed for five years.

During that time Laurence and his writing partner Maurice Gran went on to become household names, writing award-winning sitcoms such as *The New Statesmen* and *Birds of a Feather*.

Deciding to revive the Longines watch, Marks realised that it had started to lose time and took it to a City of London repair shop. Three weeks later he received a call asking him to come into the shop.

"The watch repairer asked me if the watch was a family heirloom," Marks recalls. "I told him it wasn't, but asked him why he asked."

"He removed the back of the watch, handed me an eyeglass, and said 'Well?' What I saw were the initials 'JVR'."

Nothing strange in that. But in addition to the initials there was a small elegantly engraved swastika, under which was engraved a date: 1930.

"I asked the watch repairer who JVR was," says Marks, "but he had no idea. He said that if I was really interested I should take the watch to Sotheby's. They would be able to tell me."

After 16 weeks, Sotheby's Watch and Clock department confirmed that the watch was genuine, was bought in Berlin in 1930, belonged to Joachim Von Ribbentrop and was exceedingly valuable.

"I knew Joachim Von Ribbentrop was Hitler's friend and fixer, as well as his Foreign Minister. And wasn't he the man who signed the Von Ribbentrop-Molotov Pact, which effectively allowed the start of the Second World War? So I asked how much it was worth and was told anywhere between £40-50,000, maybe more, depending how badly a collector wanted it.

"It didn't occur to me at that time that this watch would attract dormant Nazis, who would pay a fortune just to get a little closer to a regime that they wished had survived and flourished. "Apparently, Von Ribbentrop, whilst not a first division Nazi, was very collectable. And the fact that he was the first Nazi hanged at Nuremberg could well increase the watch's value," Marks says.

How the watch ended up in a second-hand watch shop in California is anyone's guess, although Sotheby's suggested a US guard may have stolen it from Von Ribbentrop as he awaited execution in his Nuremberg cell.

When Marks told the news to his friend and writing partner Maurice Gran, Gran said he couldn't possibly sell the watch because he would effectively be pocketing Nazi money.

"As a Jew," Marks says, "I could see Maurice had a point."

"What if I sold it and gave the money to a Jewish charity? A synagogue that needs a new roof, perhaps? A Jewish youth club community hall?

"I did enquire to one or two Jewish charities about making a substantial donation, but once they heard where the money was going to come from from, they either said a polite 'No, thank you', or slammed down the phone.

"And of course I could understand that the Von Ribbentrop Community Hall attached to a north London synagogue could be seen in bad taste.

"So I was left with this dilemma for many months."

Maurice Gran finally suggested writing a play about the dilemma: what does a Jew do with a Nazi watch, particularly if he needs the money? I immediately could envisage what a good play this would make and after three or more years of discussion we wrote *Von Ribbentrop's Watch*," says Marks. "What else could we call it?

"I then did as Maurice suggested and put the watch away in a safe and there it will remain. No fascist or Nazi sympathiser will ever get their hands on it. "But the bigger question remains: What would you have done in my position?"

"Von Ribbentrop's Watch'" opens at the Oxford Playhouse on September 9 (01865 305305), before moving to Watford Palace Theatre (01923 225 671), Richmond Theatre (020 8939 9260), and Salisbury Playhouse (01722

http://www.telegraph.co.uk/expat/expatlife/7990230/Von-Ribbentrops-watch.html

---

Germany: Demjanjuk trial meets after summer break

By ANDREA M. JARACH (AP)

MUNICH, Germany — Ukrainian guards risked being killed by their SS supervisors if they tried to flee Nazi death camps where they served, according to evidence presented Monday at the trial of John Demjanjuk, the retired Ohio autoworker accused of being a death camp guard.

The 90-year-old, Ukrainian-born Demjanjuk has denied ever having served as a guard. However, the historical evidence could bolster his defense's separate argument that any Ukrainians who agreed to serve the Nazis did so to escape deplorable conditions in prisoner of war camps, or possible death, and couldn't flee once they learned they would be guarding death camps.

Demjanjuk faces 28,060 counts of accessory to murder on allegations he served as a guard at the Nazi's Sobibor death camp in occupied Poland.

The prosecution argues that after Demjanjuk, a Soviet Red Army soldier, was captured by the Germans in 1942 he agreed to serve under the SS as a guard.

Demjanjuk says he spent most of the rest of the war in Nazi POW camps before joining the so-called Vlasov Army of anti-communist Soviet POWs and others. That army was formed to fight with the Germans against the encroaching Soviets in the final months of the war.

A 1943 letter from the Auschwitz death camp administration to authorities in Germany, presented to the court Monday, seemed to reinforce the defense argument.

In it, the Auschwitz officials reported that 15 Ukrainian guards attempted to escape and that while six succeeded, one was recaptured and eight were killed.

The reading of historical evidence into the record by trial judges came after a monthlong summer break in the trial, which began last November.

Unlike in previous sessions, Demjanjuk wore regular glasses instead of sunglasses and had no cap pulled low over his face. When asked by Presiding Judge Ralph Alt if he was feeling well enough to follow the proceedings sitting up rather than lying on a bed as usual, however, he said he wasn't.

"I must lie down," he said through his interpreter.

(This version corrects that letter was sent to authorities in Germany, not to the camp where the guards were trained.)

http://www.google.com/hostednews/ap/article/ALeqM5hIH0N3mJ1HhKJrBMWn3uUa8WpghAD9I7711G1

German police raid largest neo-Nazi group

The Associated Press, Monday, Sept. 13, 2010 | 12:10 a.m.

Police on Tuesday raided buildings used by Germany's largest neo-Nazi group in an effort to find evidence to support banning it, the Interior Ministry said.

The sweep targeted 30 buildings and houses across the country belonging to members of the Aid Organization for National Political Victims and their Relatives, the ministry said in a statement. It declined to say how many officers were taking part in the raids in nine of the country's 16 states.

The group, known as HNG by its German acronym, is believed to have some 600 members, making it the country's largest neo-Nazi group, the ministry said.

Evidence found in the raids will show whether the HNG's work violates Germany's constitution in an "aggressive and combative" manner that could lead to a ban, Deputy Interior Minister Klaus-Dieter Fritsche said. Investigators suspect the HNG is trying to strengthen Germany's scattered far-right groups by forging alliances among the organizations, he said.

The ministry accused HNG members of keeping in contact with imprisoned neo-Nazis to strengthen the members' ideology and "encourage them to commit further crimes."

German authorities are wary of neo-Nazi groups and several of them have been banned over the past years. Denying the Holocaust and displaying Nazi symbols or otherwise glorifying them are crimes in Germany.

http://www.lasvegassun.com/news/2010/sep/13/german-police-raid-largest-neo-nazi-group/

Because of THIS we are anti-semitic?? Jewish voices beg to differ

Eva Bartlett, In Gaza, October 28, 2009

http://www.petitiononline.com/sc12ijvc/petition.html

The Canadian Parliamentary Coalition to Combat Anti-Semitism (CPCCA) and Canada's Israel representatives are waging a propaganda and legal battle to silence the expanding number of people and organizations who support Palestinian rights or are critical of Israel for its illegal occupation, invasions and siege of Palestine.

The CPCCA is joining the Conservative government, the B'nai Brith, and the Canadian Jewish Congress (CJC), in an ambitious plan to censor civil dialogue by deliberately confusing criticism of Israel and Zionism with anti-Semitism.

In rejection and response, The Independent Jewish Voices of Canada wrote this petition. And I ask:

Because we recognize the Zionists brutally displaced Palestinians from their land and razed Palestinian villages in the process, and have never recognized Palestinian refugees right of return (although the UN has)…

Because we recognize Israel is brutally occupying the West Bank, East Jerusalem and militarily controlling Gaza…

Because we call for Palestinian prisoners to be released, that they not be tortured, that they are given a fair trial (not in a military court) and charged with something instead of held indefinitely in "administrative detention", that children are not imprisoned…

Because we (like Goldstone [see his recent comments]) call for the investigation of Israel's war crimes and breaches of international law…

Because we support the right to free speech, including that of Palestinian academics…

Because Palestinians have the right to resist the occupation and siege, and when they do so non-violently they are brutally suppressed by the Israeli occupation forces, killed [Yousef Amira, Ahmed Mousa, Bassem Abu Rahmah, and many, many more) or are arrested without grounds, as with Mohammad Othman, Adeeb Abu Rahme...

Because Palestinians can be mowed down, shot dead, beaten, and tortured by Israeli soldiers without any chance of the soldiers being prosecuted...

Because Boycott, Divestment, and Sanctions (BDS) are a real and valid form of fighting Israel's occupation, oppression, racism and war-mongering...

Because of these martyrs and families of martyrs, lives ruined in Israel's massacre of Gaza:

From Adelaide Institute Archives

John J. DiIulio, Jr.: My Black Crime Problem, and Ours

Why are so many blacks in prison? Is the criminal justice system racist?

The answer is disquieting. Spring 1996

Violent crime is down in New York and many other cities, but there are two big reasons to keep the champagne corked. One is that murder, rape, robbery, and assault remain at historic highs: the streets of Manhattan, like those of Houston, Philadelphia, Detroit, Chicago, and Los Angeles, remain much less safe today than in the 1950s and 1960s. Worse, though policing and prison policies matter, nothing affects crime rates more than the number of young males in the population—and by the year 2010, there will be about 4.5 million more males age 17 or under than there were in 1990: 8 percent more whites and 26 percent more blacks. Since around 6 percent of young males turn out to be career criminals, according to the historical data, this increase will put an estimated 270,000 more young predators on the streets than in 1990, coming at us in waves over the next two decades. Numerous studies show that each succeeding generation of young male criminals commits about three times as much serious crime as the one before it: the occasional fatal knife fight of 1950s street gangs has given way to the frequent drive-by shootings of 1990s gangs.

The second reason to keep the champagne corked is that not only is the number of young black criminals likely to surge, but also the black crime rate, both black-on-black and black-on-white, is increasing, so that as many as half of these juvenile super-predators could be young black males. But just when we need to think most earnestly about black crime, the space for honest discourse about race and crime is shrinking. The evidence of that shrinkage is everywhere: in the lickety-split O.J. verdict and its racially polarized aftermath, in the utter certitude of many blacks that the justice system is rigged against them, in the belief of many whites that violent crime is synonymous with black crime and the fear they feel of every young black male passerby not wearing a tie or handcuffs.

What has made our views on race and crime so polarized—and often so out of touch with reality? What *are* the facts about race and crime? And what are Americans, blacks and whites together, to do about it?

Many blacks, and some whites, believe that the justice system is biased against blacks, at worst purposefully racist or even "genocidal." Take a recent *New Yorker* article, in which Henry Louis Gates Jr., leader of Harvard University's black studies program, chronicled "Thirteen Ways of Looking at a Black Man," namely, the acquitted O.J. Simpson. Gates writes: "Perhaps you didn't know that Liz Claiborne appeared

on *Oprah* and said she didn't design her clothes for black women—that their hips were too wide. Perhaps you didn't know that the soft drink Tropical Fantasy is manufactured by the Ku Klux Klan and contains a special ingredient to sterilize black men. . . . Perhaps you didn't know these things but a good many black Americans think they do. . . . Never mind that Liz Claiborne has never appeared on *Oprah*, [or] that the beleaguered Brooklyn [soft drink] company has gone as far as to make an FDA assay of its ingredients. . . . If you wonder why blacks seem particularly susceptible to rumors and conspiracy theories, you might take a look at a history in which the official story was a poor guide to anything that mattered much, and in which rumor sometimes verged on the truth. Heard the one about the L.A. cop who hated interracial couples, fantasized about making a bonfire of black bodies, and boasted of planting evidence?"

Gates, like the renowned sociologist William Julius Wilson, one of the prominent black Americans whose views of the O.J. verdict he cites, was convinced that O.J. was guilty. But he recounts a story Wilson told him about once being stopped near a small New England town by a policeman who wanted to know what he was doing in those parts: "There's a moving violation that many African-Americans know as DWB: Driving While Black," notes Gates. As "older blacks like to repeat," when "white folks say 'justice,' they mean 'just us.'" In other words, blacks really do experience enough casual, reflexive racism from law enforcement officers to make them understandably fearful that racism permeates the criminal justice system.

A point well taken. But then Gates's article goes astray: it never makes plain that, in spite of these reasonable anxieties and resentments, some ways of "looking at a black man"—at any man—are right and reasonable while others are wrong and malicious. Some of the people who burst into jubilation over the O.J. verdict were celebrating the release of a man whom they believed to be innocent. With due regard for the fact that two families have lost loved ones, that's okay. But other blacks partied to a he-killed-the-blonde-and-got-away-with-it tune. For example, a sign held by a woman whose picture appeared in the *New York Times Magazine* read: "Guilty or Not We Love You O.J." Gates quotes film director Spike Lee as follows: "A lot of black folks said, 'Man, O.J. is *bad*, you know. This is the first brother in the history of the world who got away with murder of white folks, and a blonde, blue-eyed woman at that.'" Lee, Gates reports, "wasn't happy" at the verdict. But some black folks were thrilled—and for morally indefensible reasons that Gates needs to condemn, not artfully explain.

Nevertheless, the ambivalence and mistrust that many blacks feel toward the justice system is a social reality that whites can't ignore. *The Weekly Standard's* deputy editor, John Podhoretz, wrote in the magazine about the O.J. verdict and race relations under the double-meaning heading "Yes, We Do Understand": "How can most black Americans believe (or say they believe) that O.J. Simpson is innocent of a crime science tells us there is a one-in-a-billion chance he did not commit? . . . We—that is, we upper-middle-class whites—must, by a process of study and observation, come to*understand*. And it will be 'white' institutions, from the Ford Foundation to the *New York Times* to America's corporations, that will insist on fostering this *understanding*. . . . For the American liberal establishment, this has become the stock response after a public outrage that divides Americans by color. . . . Is black America so lost in its own resentment . . . that they feel closer kinship to a killer because of his skin color than to the killer's victims? I can understand how this has happened, but it makes me sick."

Like Gates, Podhoretz never arrives at the right moral point. The point is that to *understand* is neither to forgive any criminal his crime nor to sit still when "racism" is used as an all-purpose excuse for morally abhorrent or socially pathological behavior. Like Podhoretz, I have little patience with liberal elites of whatever color who are nothing better than well-funded nihilists. I could not care less about understanding what they have to say, and I would not be the least bit concerned—if they were the only ones saying it.

But they aren't. All of us, "upper-middle-class whites" included, are morally required to understand and ponder what so many black folks have to say—not only the knee-jerk liberal pundits and politicians, but also world-class professors (like Wilson), plumbers, postal workers, paramedics, prosecutors, preachers, and (in my case) former students. Many of them are saying that they feel the justice system is as much a foe as a friend. As I will summarize below, I find almost nothing in the empirical research literature on racial disparities in sentencing to justify their fears and frustrations. But that does not mean their fears and frustrations are without any sort of empirical basis, including the kind that, for most of us, counts more than any other—our own lived experiences and those of our family and friends.

As Gates recalls, Norman Podhoretz, the father of John Podhoretz and until recently the editor of*Commentary*, wrote a famous soul-searching 1963 essay, "My Negro Problem, and Ours." Gates describes the essay as "one of the frankest accounts we have of liberalism and race resentment," a plainspoken tale of "a Brooklyn boyhood spent under the shadow of carefree, cruel Negro assailants, and of the author's residual unease when he passes groups of blacks in his Upper West Side neighborhood." In one key passage, the elder Podhoretz noted: "I know now, as I did not know when I was a child, that power is on my side, that the police are working for me and not for them."

But I knew. Growing up in rough-edged, white-ethnic, working-class neighborhoods of Philadelphia in the 1960s and 1970s, I knew—as all the kids I grew up with knew—that when push literally came to shove, the police would be "working for me and not for them." Each morning on my way to high school, I stood by myself at a bus stop, surrounded mainly by black teenagers from adjacent neighborhoods. I was by myself, but I was not alone. I knew that the cop in the cruiser was looking out for me in case "they" started trouble that I could not handle.

My old neighborhood had its biracial, but strictly segregated, parks and playgrounds. When interracial fights did break out, everyone ran when the cops came. But we white boys knew that if we got caught and showed due deference to the officers (*never* mouth off to a panting cop), we'd get lectured, get our hair pulled, or (at most) get our fathers called. We also knew the black boys would get that and worse—slapped, clubbed, and maybe arrested.

Once when I was unloading 100-pound flour bags at a downtown pizzeria where I worked, the cops came zooming up the sidewalk, got out of their cruiser, and pushed my pal and co-worker, Willie Brown, against the wall. They did not touch me. Willie, an illiterate black man then in his forties, had done nothing. I protested, and the cops sped off as quickly as they had come: "Sorry, kid, we got a call that somebody was stealing." But the only "somebody" they grabbed was the black man, and the only apology they issued was to the white boy.

I recall the second time my father, a retired deputy sheriff, ran a citywide race for sheriff and appointed me his manager (mainly to teach me something about politics before I "bought whatever they think they know about it at Harvard"). He ran on a real rainbow-coalition ticket with former deputy mayor Charles Bowser, Philly's first major black mayoral candidate. We lost the election (no surprise) as well as good relations with some neighbors (sad surprise), one of whom loudly scolded me that "we'll never be safe from crime if *they're* in charge of it."

Even though I am now a card-carrying elite professor and "upper-middle-class white," I have stayed close to home. I hang out with the same white working-class relatives and friends I've known all my life. I live a few minutes by car from some of Philadelphia's worst black neighborhoods. So I have a very different perspective from that of most white intellectuals, both on the white ethnics who turn into the cops blacks fear and on the everyday reality of life in black communities. And as little as the white policy elites, liberal or

conservative, know about "the black experience," believe me, they know less about what race means in the lives of those Italian-American bricklayers, Irish-American gas pumpers, and Polish-American salesclerks whom the U.S. Census bureaucrats have baptized "non-Hispanic whites." We need to understand these folks, too—and especially how their experience of black-white relations leaves a tangle of powerful contradictions and ambivalences, as I know vividly from my own experience.

I indelibly remember taking a jump shot on the playground when I was ten. As the ball left my hand, instead of invoking, for luck, the name of a white star (as was customary), I unthinkingly shouted the name of a black star. "Nigger lover!" snapped a scandalized playmate. But the following week, the same kid punched out a white schoolyard bully for bothering a black girl who wandered by. I'll never forget how much, when my frail grandmother got kicked, punched, and robbed in broad daylight for the third time (on her way to church, no less), the fact that her assailants were (once again) black boys got under my white skin. The memory of the anger is still there—along with the image of her in her hospital bed, imploring her strapping grandsons, some of us cops, to "love all God's people."

So it's no mystery to me that blacks tense when they see a white cop coming: they know the Willie Brown experience well enough, and how could they possibly know the sense of justice regardless of race, even the Christian *caritas* transcending race, that can lie beneath the blue uniform and the white skin? Just that white ambivalence is as familiar territory to me as it was to Norman Podhoretz. I grew up with it; I know that casual racism is there; I know the anger and shame you feel at seeing it all around you—and I know the competing anger, no less familiar: the anger at the knowledge that when real violence erupts, all too often the assailants are (once again) black.

Honest blacks know this, too. In a recent issue of *The New Republic*, Boston University economist Glenn Loury writes of inner-city black communities: "'What manner of people are you who live like this?' The question is unavoidable. . . . It does no good to say that these are a minority of black persons; that there are good and sufficient reasons for their troubling behaviors; that others, who are not black, have also fallen short." Of middle-class blacks, he admits: "We are afraid to go into these communities. We do not recognize these kids as us; the distance is great and difficult to bridge."

My black crime problem, and ours, is that for most Americans, especially for average white Americans, the distance is not merely great but almost unfathomable, the fear is enormous and largely justifiable, and the black kids who inspire the fear seem not merely unrecognizable but alien. Not that we can't understand where they come from, when we stop to consider. After all, the child is father to the man: and think how many inner-city black children are without parents, relatives, neighbors, teachers, coaches, or clergymen to teach them right from wrong, give them loving and consistent discipline, show them the moral and material value of hard work and study, and bring them to cherish the self-respect that comes only from respecting the life, liberty, and property of others. Think how many black children grow up where parents neglect and abuse them, where other adults and teenagers harass and harm them, where drug dealers exploit them. Not surprisingly, in return for the favor, some of these children kill, rape, maim, and steal without remorse. And around goes the negative feedback loop: reasonable fear feeds unreasonable white race hostility, whose reality in turn feeds unreasonable black paranoia about the justice system.

Is there anything social science research can do to help dispel all the ambivalence and confusion crowding around the subject of race and crime? At least it can tell the truth, as the data disclose it, about the reality of black crime and black punishment. The bottom line of most of the best research is that America's justice system is not racist, not anymore, not as it undoubtedly was only a generation ago—in spite of the Driving While Black experience. If blacks are overrepresented in the ranks of the imprisoned, it is because blacks are overrepresented in the criminal ranks—and the violent criminal ranks, at that. Yes, there are ways in which the justice system is failing all Americans, including black Americans. But to the extent that the justice system hurts, rather than helps, blacks more than it does whites, it is not by incarcerating a "disproportionate" number of young black men. Rather, it is by ignoring poor black victims and letting convicted violent and repeat black criminals, both adult and juvenile, continue to victimize and demoralize the black communities that suffer most of their depredations.

Consider the data. A 1993 study of the racial impact of federal sentencing guidelines found that the imposition between 1986 and 1990 of stiffer penalties for drug offenders, especially cocaine traffickers, did not result in racially disparate sentences. The amount of the drug sold, the seriousness of the offender's prior criminal history, whether weapons were involved, and other such valid characteristics of criminals and their crimes accounted for *all* the observed interracial variations in prison sentences.

Similarly, a 1991 RAND Corporation study of adult robbery and burglary defendants in 14 large U.S. cities found that a defendant's race or ethnic group bore almost no relation to conviction rates, sentencing severity, or other key measures. In 1995, federal government statistician Patrick A. Langan analyzed data on 42,500 defendants in the nation's 75 largest counties and found "no evidence that, in the places where blacks in the United States have most of their contacts with the justice system, that system treats them more harshly than whites."

A 1985 study by Langan of black-white differentials in imprisonment rates demonstrated that "even if racism exists, it might explain only a small part of the gap between the 11 percent black representation in the United States adult population and the now nearly 50 percent black representation among persons entering state prisons each year in the United States." An otherwise typically liberal-leaning 1993 National Academy of Sciences study voiced the same basic conclusion.

It is often asserted that the 1980s war on drugs resulted in a more racially "disproportionate" prison population. The data tell a different story. In 1980, 46.6 percent of state prisoners and 34.4 percent of federal prisoners were black; by 1990, 48.9 percent of state prisoners and 31.4 percent of federal prisoners were black. In 1988, the median time served in confinement by black violent offenders was 25 months, versus 24 months for their white counterparts. The mean sentence lengths were 116 months for blacks and 110 for whites, while the mean times actually served in confinement were 37 months for blacks, 33 months for whites. These small differences are explained by the fact that black violent crimes are generally more serious than white ones (aggravated rather than simple assaults, weapon-related crimes rather than weaponless ones).

Indeed, the evidence on the race-neutrality of incarceration decisions is now so compelling that even topflight criminologists who rail against the anti-drug regime, mandatory sentencing laws, three-strikes laws, and other policies with which they disagree are nonetheless careful to contend that racial biases are "built into the law," are "America's dirty little secret," or constitute "malign neglect." In other words, they do everything but challenge the proposition that blacks and whites who do the same crimes and have similar criminal records are now handled by the system in the same ways.

In this vein, liberal experts contend that the penalties for crack cocaine possession and sale are excessive compared with powder cocaine penalties. I concur. And liberals are also right that blacks are far more likely than whites to use and sell crack instead of powder cocaine. But they go badly wrong on two key counts. First, they feed the conspiratorial myth that federal anti-crack penalties were born of a white conspiracy led by right-wing Republicans. Go check the *Congressional Record:*in 1986, when the federal crack law was debated, the Congressional Black Caucus (CBC) supported it, and some CBC members pressed for even harsher penalties. A few years earlier it was CBC members and other Democrats in Congress

who pushed President Reagan, against his considered judgment, to create the Office of National Drug Control Policy (better known as the drug czar's office). And it was President Clinton who recently refused in no uncertain terms to change the federal penalty structure for drug crimes.

Second, liberal experts and advocates of drug legalization cloud the facts about who really goes to prison for drug crimes. As I and several other researchers have concluded, society gets little return on its investment in locking up low-level offenders who possess or even traffic in small amounts of drugs and commit no other crimes. But most drug offenders, both those behind bars and those who have served their time, do not fit that description.

As a recent study funded by the National Institute of Justice and other federal agencies acknowledged, in "an important sense the label 'drug offender' is a misnomer." Few "drug offenders" are in prison for mere possession. In 1991, for example, only 2 percent of the 36,648 persons admitted to federal prisons were in for drug possession. Moreover, as for imprisoned drug*traffickers*, most have long and diversified criminal records—only their latest and most serious conviction offense is a drug-trafficking offense. Even in the much-maligned federal system, few convicted drug traffickers, whether they handle crack, powder cocaine, or pot, are black college kids or white white-collar types arrested on the interstate by a state trooper who found a small stash under the driver's seat. The average quantity of drugs involved in federal cocaine trafficking cases is 183 pounds, while the average for marijuana traffickers is 3.5 tons.

In an ongoing study of who really goes to prison in Wisconsin, George Mitchell and I are examining the complete criminal records, adult and juvenile, of a randomly selected sample of imprisoned felons from Milwaukee County. We are finding that the imprisoned "drug offenders," black and white, like most of the rest of the sample, have committed many times more property, drug, and violent crimes than the latest entries on their prison rap sheets would indicate. This is not to mention all the crimes swept completely under the official-records rug by plea bargaining, or all the wholly undetected, unprosecuted, and unpunished crimes the prisoners have committed while free.

Of course, there are cases of truly petty drug dealers, black and white, being hit with long, hard time. But such cases are the exception that proves the rule, and the rule is that the system is neither harsh nor racist in dealing with "drug offenders" or other criminals.

Some experts will come *almost* to the point of agreement with all that, but still will insist that the system is anything but color-blind when it comes to two important tasks: punishing juveniles and dishing out death sentences. But here, too, the evidence does more to exonerate than to indict the system.

Out of hundreds of post-1969 studies of minorities in the juvenile justice system, barely two dozen offer evidence of any pattern of racial discrimination. Even so, liberal strongholds like the federal Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP)—which made a cavalierly fragmentary and outdated examination of only 46 of the 250 relevant studies—continue to purvey the myth that young black offenders are treated more severely than young white ones. Notwithstanding OJJDP and its race-baiting minions, the truth is not that the juvenile system is racist, or that the states incarcerate too many minority juvenile offenders—or, indeed, too many juvenile offenders of whatever background.

Rather, as the National District Attorneys Association and other law enforcement officials have said for years, the juvenile system is an even worse revolving door than the adult system. For example, in 1991 fewer than 20,000 male juvenile violent offenders were in public juvenile facilities—but in 1992 alone there were more than 110,000 juvenile arrests for violent crimes, and more than 1.6 million juvenile arrests for other crimes. In most states, police, prosecutors, and judges do not even have complete access to juvenile records, and some states still forbid fingerprinting juveniles, including kids charged with weapons offenses that would be grade-A felonies if committed by adults.

Over the coming decade, juvenile arrests in California and many other states are projected to increase by some 25 percent, even more for minority juveniles. By the year 2005 we will probably have 200,000 convicted juvenile criminals, half of them black males, in secure confinement, including adult prisons and jails—over three times more than the number of incarcerated juveniles today. The reason for this will not be racism or what OJJDP calls "disproportionate minority confinement." The reason will be that more black boys grew up without adults who were willing and able to save them—and their victims—from tragedy.

What should be done with cold-blooded killers of whatever race? Like most other Americans, the majority of black Americans favor the death penalty. Yet around that punishment swirls the most acrimonious of all racial disparity controversies. Here too, though, the data disclose no trace of racism.

Reviewing the evidence in 1994, Professors Stanley Rothman and Stephen Powers concluded that after controlling for all relevant variables, one finds simply no evidence of racial disparities in post-1972 capital sentencing. The crucial variable is the severity of the crime. Though the vast majority of murders are committed by someone of the same race as the victim, black-on-white murders are more likely than black-on-black murders to be cases of strangers killing strangers and to "involve kidnapping and rape, mutilations, execution-style murders, tortures, and beatings," according to Rothman and Powers. "These are all aggravating circumstances that increase the likelihood of a death sentence."

Even the raw statistics don't show much sign of racism. From the day the U.S. Supreme Court reinstated the death penalty in 1976 through the end of 1993, more than 400,000 Americans were murdered. Over the same period, only 226 killers were executed, 38 percent of them black. In 1993, blacks were 40 percent of the 2,716 prisoners on death row and 36 percent of the 38 convicted murderers executed. The scandalous truth is, most of the thousands of murderers behind bars don't face too harsh but too lenient a punishment. Most get out of prison. Murderers released from state prisons in 1992 served an average of only 5.9 years. There is no evidence that black murderers get out any less quickly than comparable white ones.

Yet, as with juvenile justice, anti-death penalty partisans, including congressmen, promote racially charged falsehoods like those that flew during the 1994 debate in Congress over the so-called Racial Justice Act (RJA). Though this disgraceful bill, which would have established a de facto racial quota system in murder cases, was defeated, it got very serious consideration. It was based on the shoddiest possible research, purporting to show that because of racism, more blacks than whites are executed for similar crimes, and that the law values white victims' lives more than black victims' lives. But in fact, contrary to the fevered fantasies of the RJA's supporters that we have hardly progressed beyond the days of racist lynchings, we actually have arrived at a day when in murder cases generally, and in black-on-white murder cases in particular, "going for the death penalty" has become such a political, judicial, and media nightmare for big-city prosecutors that many urban DAs do not even try. Many, like L.A. District Attorney Gil Garcetti—the man who spared O.J. a death sentence even faster than the jury spared him any sentence at all—not only avoid the death penalty but seem more concerned with preempting any possibility of false but damaging accusations of racism than in following the rule of law, protecting the public, doing the work, and taking the heat.

Recently a page-one story in the *Wall Street Journal* tackled the question of "jury nullification" in cases involving black defendants. It is increasingly common for black jurors to "side with African-American defendants against a mostly white-dominated justice system," even to the point of acquitting black defendants whom the jurors know to be guilty on the legal merits—and even when the victims are black. More black jurors "are choosing to disregard the evidence, however powerful, because they seek to protest racial injustice and to

refrain from adding to the already large number of blacks behind bars." The story noted that in the Bronx, where juries are more than 80 percent black and Hispanic, black defendants are acquitted in felony cases 47.6 percent of the time—three times the national acquittal rate of 17 percent for all races. In Washington, D.C., where virtually all defendants and 70 percent of jurors are black, 28.7 percent of all felony trials end in acquittals. Similar patterns hold in Detroit and several other cities where black jurors predominate. Paul Butler, a black criminal-law professor at George Washington University, was quoted as arguing that in cases involving black defendants charged with nonviolent crimes, black jurors should "presume in favor of nullification."

A response to racism? Something more is at issue, for this isn't happening just in cases where black jurors are hearing white cops testify against black criminals. Black jurors' resistance to police witnesses has grown even as virtually every big city has increased the percentage of blacks on its police force, moved the force ever nearer to mirroring the racial composition of its citizenry, and seen blacks become precinct captains, deputy chiefs, commissioners, and mayors. Between 1983 and 1992, the percentage of blacks on big-city police forces increased in each and every one of the nation's ten biggest police departments—rising 50 percent to 67.8 percent in Washington, D.C., to take one example, where blacks were 65.8 percent of the local population.

Most whites and blacks now accept living, working, shopping, playing, side by side—every interracial interaction save marriage. And yet on crime, America seems closer than ever to becoming two nations separated by race rather than one nation under God. Why? At least part of the reason is that we are inundated with statistics about race, crime, and punishment that needlessly fan black concerns about white racism.

In 1993 the National Center on Institutions and Alternatives (NCIA), an advocacy group that opposes mandatory sentencing and favors making a greater use of probation, parole, and rehabilitation programs, publicized its finding that "43 percent of all young black men in Washington, D.C.—and 56 percent in Baltimore—are firmly in the grip of the justice system." The press broadcast the numbers far and wide. As was later revealed in an analysis by the American Alliance for Rights and Responsibilities, the statistics were a bit inflated, but even after appropriate correction, the NCIA study would still have found about 35 percent of Washington's young black men in prison, in jail, on probation, or on parole. Indeed, in a highly publicized 1995 report, the Sentencing Project, a Washington-based counterpart of NCIA, found that nationwide about one in three black males age 20 to 29 was under some form of correctional supervision. As the Sentencing Project reported, in 1989 about 610,000 black males in their twenties—23 percent of the cohort—were in custody. But by 1995 that number had risen to over 827,000—32.2 percent of the nation's twenty-something black males. One could quibble with the estimates, but the finding is valid; in fact, my own estimates would indicate that the number is already closer to 50 percent in some places, and that nationally it will be nearer to a half than a third by the year 2000.

As the Sentencing Project boasts, "the report has had a major impact in the media and among policymakers." Oddly, however, its "major impact" has been to divert attention from the big truth that one in three young black males is under correctional supervision because young black male rates of serious crime are so high. Instead it has focused attention on the half-truths and outright distortions long purveyed by the Sentencing Project, other anti-incarceration advocacy groups, and their funders and allies in the drug legalization movement, the liberal foundations, the politically correct universities, and the elite media. The mantra goes like this: how shameful to America that one in three young black males is in custody . . . most of those in custody are in for petty drug crimes . . . revolving-door justice is a right-wing myth . . . the justice system is racist . . . America has been on an imprisonment binge . . . prisons don't cut crime in the least . . . imprisonment is not only an ineffective response to crime but a racist one.

Predictably, the Sentencing Project and its turn-'em-loose comrades-in-arms have now begun to dig for more such racially polarizing pay dirt. For example, the Center for Juvenile and Criminal Justice in San Francisco recently "found" that 40 percent of black men in their twenties in California were under some form of correctional supervision. Representative Maxine Waters held a news conference in which she declared the study proof that in California the color of your skin dictates whether you will be arrested or not, prosecuted harshly or less harshly, or receive a stiff sentence or gain probation or entry into treatment. The report itself called for a moratorium on prison construction in California until the state's penal code is "overhauled." It also called for mandating "racial impact statements" in all new crime legislation, and for a state commission to study black "overrepresentation." Except for a very few dissenting voices, including the nation's leading crime-policy scholar, UCLA's James Q. Wilson, virtually all the published and broadcast "expert" commentary on this report followed the radical-liberal party line.

The Sentencing Project and its supporters can pretend all they want that racism and the "war on drugs" have put too many harmless young black males in prison. But are racist drug laws responsible for the fact that *weapons arrest rates* during 1993 were five times greater for blacks than for whites? Do they explain the fact that 47 percent of all black men in prison in 1995 were in for a *violent crime*, and that most black state prisoners, like most state prisoners, have committed one or more violent crimes in the past? Do they explain the fact that the black men in prison for a drug crime were, like virtually all prisoners, *repeat offenders* with non-drug crimes on their rap sheets?

There are Washington monument-sized fallacies and contradictions in what the Sentencing Project and its allied spin doctors have argued about "1 in 3." For example, the system is supposedly "racist" because it hammers black drug dealers. But who wants them hammered? Look at the survey data on decriminalizing or legalizing drugs. Without fail, blacks are every bit as opposed to weakening anti-drug enforcement efforts as whites. Only 30 percent of blacks would even consider legalizing marijuana; virtually none will even debate legalizing harder drugs. My dear friend and former colleague Ethan Nadelmann is director of the Lindesmith Center and the country's leading proponent of turning down the volume on the drug war. His most vehement, unyielding critics are not middle-class whites led by right-wing Republicans. Rather, they are poor and working-class blacks led by folks like New York's black Democratic Representative Charles Rangel.

What if, for argument's sake, one swallows the notion that the system now "over-punishes" black drug dealers, and that most of these "drug dealers" are not, in fact, plea bargain–gorged persons with long adult and juvenile records of criminal mischief against persons and property? What then? Which drug-crime 911 calls from black neighborhoods are the police to ignore? Which black drug dealers should be released back to their communities tomorrow morning?

You can't have it both ways—protesting that police are less responsive to black crime victims than to white ones in one breath, charging that "too many" black victimizers get caught, convicted, and sentenced, in the next; spinning out conspiratorial theories of white acquiescence in letting drugs flow into black communities in the morning, complaining that efforts to crack down on the drug trade are motivated by racism in the afternoon.

Take a look at the chart on page 27. Based on its latest crime victimization surveys, the U.S. Bureau of Justice Statistics estimates that in 1993 alone blacks committed 1.29 million violent crimes against other blacks—80 percent of all violent crimes against blacks. Blacks also committed 1.54 million violent crimes against whites—18 percent of all violent crimes against whites.

As a number of analysts have begun to notice, blacks are about 50 times more likely to commit violent crimes against

whites than whites are to commit violent crimes against blacks. Like the Sentencing Project's "1 in 3" number, this "50 to 1" statistic is technically correct. If you divide the total number of black-on-white violent crimes in 1993 (1.29 million) by the number of black males age 20 to 29 in the population in 1993 (3.94 million), you get a ratio equal to 1,013 violent crimes against whites per 10,000 young black males. If you do the same calculation for the total number of white-on-black crimes (186,000) divided by the total number of twenty-something white males (22.9 million), you get a ratio of 17.6 violent crimes committed by whites against blacks for every 10,000 young white males. Thus, the incidence of interracial black-on-white violent crime by young black males (1,013) is 57.5 times the incidence of interracial white-on-black crime by young white males (17.6). Using different denominators (for example, white versus black males age 15 to 29) moves the statistic down a bit (in the example given, to 48 to 1). But it clusters around "50 to 1."

In his recent essay in *The New Republic*, Glenn Loury explains that "there are roughly eight times as many whites as blacks; and there are about six times as many violent criminals per capita among blacks as among whites. So, if criminals chose their victims at random, without regard to race, one would expect the black-on-white victimization rate per black person to be 48 times as large as the white-on-black rate per white person. Thus, it does not appear that black criminals take affirmative action to find white victims."

Loury is absolutely right, and he or I or any other competent analyst could fashion a half-dozen fancier ways of minimizing the "50 to 1" statistic. In the end, however, nothing we could produce would be other than cold comfort to white victims of black criminals. For every such "explanation" merely underlines the reality behind *both* "1 in 3" and "50 to 1": namely, that young black males *do*commit serious crimes at a much higher rate than whites. Worse, where the growing problems of black juvenile and "wolf pack" crimes are concerned, it may well be that young black criminals really are targeting white victims. For example, as even OJJDP has noted, while about 95 percent of all violent crimes committed by white juveniles in 1991 were against whites, 57 percent of all violent crimes committed by black juveniles also were against whites.

The simple if unpalatable truth, therefore, is that even if we decriminalized black drug-dealing, there would still be racial "disproportionalities" in the justice system. Even if we also decriminalized all black crime save black-on-black violent crime, racial "disproportionalities" would persist.

Here's a suggestive calculation. In 1991, 372,200 black men were in prison, along with 363,600 white men. About 60 percent of all prisoners in 1991 had committed one or more violent crimes in the past. Suppose that we released 40 percent of the black prisoners—the 40 percent, say, with either no official history of violence or the least severe records of it. That would leave 223,320 black men behind bars. Then, because slightly more than half of the violent crimes committed by blacks are committed against whites, let's release, say, 55 percent of the remaining black violent male offenders. That would leave 100,494 black males in prison, 27 percent of 1991ís actual total. They would be doing time with 3.6 times as many white males. But since whites in the general population still would outnumber blacks by roughly 8 to 1, the racial "disproportionality" would persist. To make it disappear completely—to get an 8-to-1 white-black ratio in prison—we would have to release all but 45,450 of the 372,200 black men in prison in 1991.

Similarly, 605,062 black adults were on probation in 1993, compared with 1,132,092 white adults, and 240,767 black adults were on parole, compared with 236,083 white adults. Thus, the total black adult community-based corrections population (probation plus parole) numbered 845,829, compared with 1.36 million whites. Let's say we believed that fully 70 percent of all black probationers and parolees, but none of the white ones, were innocent victims of a racist "war on drugs" and should never have been arrested. That would leave 253,749 black adults on probation and parole. We would still have only 5.3, not eight, times as many white adults as blacks "in custody" in the community. To eliminate entirely the racial "disproportionalities" in probation and parole, all but about 170,000 of the more than 800,000 black adults under community-based supervision in 1993 would have to be expunged from the rolls.

Even if, therefore, the justice system punished only those blacks who commit violent crimes—indeed, even if it punished only black violent criminals whose victims were themselves black—blacks would still be "overrepresented" in prison, in jail, on probation, and on parole. Thus, instead of all the ideological nonsense about "1 in 3" and the like, we should begin to focus in common on how revolving-door justice harms all Americans, most especially blacks. As the bipartisan Council on Crime in America has reported: "America's violent crime problem, especially the rage of homicidal and near-homicidal violence, is extremely concentrated among young urban minority males. . . . A study of murders committed in the nation's 75 most populous counties found that blacks were 52 percent of all murder victims and 62 percent of all murder defendants," but "they were only 20 percent of the general population in these metropolitan jurisdictions. . . . Between 1985 and 1992 the rate at which males ages 14 through 17 committed murder increased by about 50 percent for whites and over 300 percent for blacks. Between 1973 and 1992 the rate of violent victimizations of black males ages 12 to 24 increased about 25 percent; for example, black males ages 16 to 19 sustained one violent crime for 11 persons in 1973 versus one for every six in 1992."

For God's sake, let's be truthful. Especially in urban America, white fears of black crime—like black fears of black crime—are rational far more than reactionary or racist. If Americans are to learn how to deal in common with black crime as a problem of "sin, not skin," as Glenn Loury puts it—as a correctable moral defect of individuals, not some ineradicable racial fate—then we must hear and heed those leaders, black and white, liberal and conservative, who are speaking and doing something about it.

Hear Robert L. Woodson Sr., leader of the National Center for Neighborhood Enterprise. A veteran of the civil rights movement and an organizer of community- and faith-based groups that reach poor blacks and their children, Woodson speaks not of white racism but of "moral vagrants" in the black community who prey upon their disadvantaged neighbors.

Hear John W. Gillis, another prominent black, who heads California's parole board and is a member of the Council on Crime in America. On the day the council's first report was released to the press, Gillis stared into the cameras and implored responsible journalists to remember who normally puts black convicted criminals where they are, and why: black victims, black witnesses, and black communities—in order to do justice and to protect themselves from murder, mayhem, and deadly drug dealing.

Hear the grief-stricken family of Philadelphia police officer Lauretha Vaird, the city's first female cop—and first black woman—to be killed in the line of duty. Officer Vaird was murdered in cold blood, execution-style. Two of her three alleged killers are 26-year-old local black "gangsta" rappers who apparently practice the hate they sing. Vaird's family members are calling for justice—life in prison or the electric chair for the killers.

Hear Debra Dickerson, the self-described liberal black sister of a young black man paralyzed from the waist down in a drive-by shooting. Read her intensely gripping, highly personal essay published in *The New Republic*, "Who Shot Johnny?" Therein she rages at the black assailant who shot her brother and left him for dead. His "crime"? Waving hello at a car full of boys whom he mistakenly thought he knew. The assailant stood over his bleeding, barely conscious body and said, "Betch'ou won't be doin' nomo' wavin', motha'fucker." The vicious attacker was never caught.

Hear Harvard law professor Randall Kennedy, who in a 1994 *Wall Street Journal* op-ed described as "dangerous" the response "that cries 'racism' as part of an all-out defense of any black accused of wrongdoing by 'white' authorities,

regardless of the facts of the case," and as "troubling" the "position of some blacks that they will refuse to help send any black person to prison."

Hear the Reverend Jesse Jackson. For over a decade, no national black leader has argued more eloquently against policies that offer blacks jails instead of jobs—and none was quicker to make hay of the Sentencing Project's "1 in 3" finding. But recall Jackson's own tortured words on November 27, 1993: "There is nothing more painful for me at this stage of my life than to walk down the street and hear footsteps and start to think about robbery and then look around and see it's somebody white and feel relieved. How humiliating."

Above all, hear the Reverend Eugene Rivers of Boston. In the 1960s, Rivers was a member of one of Philadelphia's most violent black street gangs. Then the Reverend Ben Smith, a legend in the City of Brotherly Love, set him on the right path. As the Harvard-educated Rivers preaches: "For the people of God, every crisis, no matter how grim, presents a unique opportunity that can only be seen with the eyes of faith. For example, in racially war-torn Boston, black, Roman Catholic, and Jewish clergy have come together by faith to develop concrete strategies" for reducing crime and violence among black youth. In particular, under Rivers's leadership, dozens of black churches have begun moving together to look after abused or neglected inner-city black children, to stand up to drug dealers and gangsters, to spark local business development, and to reclaim the streets and end the terrors.

Rivers, his wife, and his two young children live in the Four Corners section of Dorchester, one of Boston's most violent black neighborhoods, where in 1991 three bullets from a gang shoot-out flew into Rivers's three-year-old son's bedroom. In 1993, Rivers grabbed a local crack merchant by the collar and told him not to deal at the local playground. "I told him, brother, I'll get you a job, I'll get you up for college—the whole nine yards," he says. "He told me to kiss his ass. So I did like I promised: I busted him—called the cops and probation and said, come get him now. They did." A week later, back on the streets and out for revenge, the kid drove by Rivers's house at 2 am and pumped it with gunfire. No one was hurt.

As Rivers recalled: "The question from all the hoodlums in the neighborhood after that was, 'Is the minister going to cut and run?'" He stayed. He reformed the kid who shot up his home. He branched out, developing alliances with other churches, setting up neighborhood crime-watch programs, and developing a host of practical, tough-love programs, including "adopting a gang" for evangelistic outreach, and commissioning "missionaries" to go to court with juveniles, to make sure both that they get a fair shake and that they comply with the court's requirements. Rivers and his small group of talented volunteers work closely with city officials, the local police, the Catholic Church and schools, and just about everyone else who might make a positive difference in the lives of the kids he's trying to save.

Rivers styles himself a "Christian black nationalist." No one in America is less romantic about the record of inner-city black churches; no one is more realistic about their dwindling congregations, often near-empty coffers, and negative attraction to today's angry young black males. At the same time, no one understands better that when you get right down to it, a resurrection of the inner-city black churches is the one and only key to the resurrection of civil society in crime-and-drugs-ravaged black inner-city neighborhoods. A moral problem—a deficit of conscience, of values, of connectedness—requires a moral solution, and only a moral institution that comes out of the black community, such as the black church, can bring to bear the moral authority to solve it. "It's barbed wire and more black juvenile super-predators," observes Rivers, "or civil society and stronger black churches. It's that simple."

Since November 1994, conservatives have been talking lots about civil society. Now, however, comes the test. Rivers, Smith, and others aren't out there talking; they're out there doing. In Smith's case, he's been doing it for 50 years, a textbook example of the self-reliant, family-centered, church-based, community-strengthening, not-a-penny-from-government approach today's conservative theorists applaud. Conservative elites who are pushing welfare cuts should be putting their own money and influence into supporting the Riverses and the Smiths of inner-city America.

As Rivers exhorts, we must "together embrace the youth, disciplining our young people." In particular, he implores Christians to remember that "whatever you do for the least of these brothers and sisters, you do for Jesus." Amen.

http://www.city-journal.org/html/6_2_my_black.html

Merkel party colleague rejects revisionism charge

September 11, 2010 © Deutsche Presse-Agentur

Berlin - The leader of the group representing ethnic Germans expelled from eastern Europe after World War II rejected accusations Saturday that she is attempting to revise history as a 'concerted campaign' against her. Christian Democrat politician Erika Steinbach had caused outrage this week when she appeared to claim Poland was jointly to blame for starting the war.

Nazi Germany invaded Poland on September 1, 1939 on the pretence that Poland was the 'aggressor' and crushed it in just a few weeks.

Steinbach said in a party meeting ' I cannot change the fact that Poland mobilized (its troops) as early as March 1939, ' echoing the Nazi pretext.

Speaking in Berlin at the annual meeting of the Federation of Expellees of which she is the president, Steinbach rejected that she was attempting to mitigate Germany's guilt in the war.

'Everyone knows who began the Second World War. Everyone knows the atrocities of Nazi Germany, and the boundless suffering that thereby came to Europe,' she said.

But the conservative politician also insisted that what she had said had not been inaccurate. 'The recent wave of outrage has shown: Nothing is as painful as the truth,' she told the assembly.

Steinbach announced Friday that she would step down in November after a decade on the national executive of Chancellor Angela Merkel's centre-right CDU, saying that she no longer felt at home there.

The Federation of Expellees is celebrating 50 years since the creation of its Charter, which rejected any German claims to the lands lost after the war, while asserting the right to 'Homeland.'

Up to 15 million ethnic Germans were forced out of Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Romania and other eastern European regions following the capitulation of Nazi Germany in May 1945.

http://www.tabletmag.com/news-and-politics/7264/the-denial-twist/